



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

1/1

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,468	08/20/2001	Christopher S. MacLellan	EMC-01-018	5620
7590	02/10/2006			
Scott A. Quellette, Esq. EMC Corporation 176 South Street Hopkinton,, MA 01748-9103			EXAMINER	TABONE JR, JOHN J
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2138	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/933,468	MACLELLAN, CHRISTOPHER S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John J. Tabone, Jr.	2138	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11302005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 remain pending in the application. Claims 9 and 21 have been amended.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The IDS filed 11/30/2005 has not been considered because it does not pertain to the Applicant's invention as claimed. In the event that the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assessment the Applicant may file, in reply to this office action, an explanation of the applicability of reference US-5668818 referring to the pertinent columns and line numbers.

Drawings

3. Figure 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because it fail to properly show the "one or more test related signals" and "the other of the two control signals" being transmitted from the first logic section (BIST LOGIC 306) to the third logic section as described in the specification. There is an error in the connectivity shown in Fig. 5. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be properly shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-10 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 13:

The claim limitation "respective assertion states of the two control signals" renders these claims indefinite because the word "assertion" implies a "high" or "one" level is always applied to the two control signals. This is not supported by the

specification or the further limiting claims 8 and 20, respectively. The limitation should read “respective states of the two control signals”. Correction is required.

Claims 2-9 and 14-21:

These claims are also rejected because they depend on claims 1 and 13, respectively, and have the same problems of indefiniteness.

Claims 1, 10:

The use of the word “may” in these claims is non-functional language and, therefore, renders theses claims indefinite. Correction is required.

Claims 9, 18 and 21:

The use of the phase “may be” in these claims is non-functional language and, therefore, renders the claim indefinite. Correction is required.

Claims 9 and 21:

The claim limitation “the second section transmits an erroneous value to be stored in the memory that may be detected during testing” in light of claims 1 and 13 renders the claim indefinite. Firstly, the conditions in which the erroneous value is transmitted are not present in the claim, i.e. what is the state of the control signals, for instance. Secondly, the second logic section is disabled or blocked during the BIST test and cannot write to the SUT. Also, the Examiner does not understand, in light of the limitation as claimed, how the “erroneous value” could be written to the SUT for later detection since in typical BIST algorithms the memory is initialized to a known value (see Evans col. 12, ll. 8-63), therefore, overwriting the “erroneous value”. Amendments to these claims and further clarification are required to clear up these issues.

Claims 6 and 18:

The claim limitation “the respective assertion state of the one of the two control signals [is/maybe] inserted” is confusing and incomprehensible, therefore, rendering these claims indefinite. Correction and clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 13, 14, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Evans (US-6966017), hereinafter Evans.

Claims 1, 2, 13 and 14:

Evans teaches a BIST controller 13 (**a first logic section, BIST logic** as per claims 2 and 14), which initiates the self-test procedure that supplies test data from data generator 17 (**one or more test related signals...during test mode, test input signals** as per claims 2 and 14) for the associated instruction cache block 11 (SUT). Evans also teaches OR gate 21 (a third logic section) will apply a control signal to switch the selector/multiplexers 23, 25, 27 (**also part of a third logic section that selectively couples the first logic section or the second logic section to the SUT**)

and 29 from their normal settings to their test settings in response either to a signal from the BIST controller 13 (**the other of the two control signals...from the first logic section**) or a tst_test_mode signal input from the JTAG controller (**one of the two control signals...from a source that is external...**). In its normal setting, the multiplexers 23, 25, 27 supplies normal control, instruction data, and address information from the other elements on the chip (**second logic section that transmits signals during normal mode**). Normally, these instructions come from the processor on the chip. (Col. 6, l. 54 to col. 8, l. 17).

Claims 6 and 18:

Evans teaches the respective assertion state of the one of the two control signals (a tst_test_mode signal input from the JTAG controller). (Col. 7, ll. 4-8).

Claims 7 and 19:

Evans substantially teaches all the claimed limitations in that The BIST engine comprises the self-test hardware multiplexed at the front end of the cache to supply all stimuli and the MISR 19 multiplexed at the back end to computes the signature. The MISR 19 receives and processes the 'miss' output as well as the instruction data output ('instout') from the cache memory block 11. The MISR 19 calculates a test signature based on the shifting of these two outputs from the cache and the attendant feedback of values from the shifted data, as the BIST controller cycles through the test procedure. (Col. 11, ll. 13-17, col. 9, ll. 4-12).

Claims 8 and 20:

Evans teaches OR gate 21 (a third logic section) will apply a control signal to switch the selector/multiplexers 23, 25, 27 (also part of a third logic section that **selectively couples the first logic section or the second logic section to the SUT**) and 29 from their normal settings to their test settings in response either to a signal from the BIST controller 13 or a tst test mode signal input from the JTAG controller (if both control signals are asserted...)). In its normal setting, the multiplexers 23, 25, 27 supplies normal control, instruction data, and address information from the other elements on the chip (**If at least one of the control signals is unasserted...**). (Col. 7, II. 4-10, col. 8, l. 4-24).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 10, 11, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans (US-6966017), hereinafter Evans.

Claims 10 and 22:

Evans teaches a BIST controller 13 (**a first logic section, BIST logic** as per claims 2 and 14), which initiates the self-test procedure that supplies test data from data generator 17 (**one or more test related signals...during test mode, test input**

signals as per claims 2 and 14) for the associated instruction cache block 11 (SUT). Evans also teaches OR gate 21 (a third logic section) will apply a control signal to switch the selector/multiplexers 23, 25, 27 (also part of a third logic section that selectively couples the first logic section or the second logic section to the SUT) and 29 from their normal settings to their test settings in response either to a signal from the BIST controller 13 (the other of the two control signals...from the first logic section) or a tst test mode signal input from the JTAG controller (one of the two control signals...from a source that is external...). In its normal setting, the multiplexers 23, 25, 27 supplies normal control, instruction data, and address information from the other elements on the chip (second logic section that transmits signals during normal mode). Normally, these instructions come from the processor on the chip. (Col. 6, l. 54 to col. 8, l. 17).

Evans does not explicitly teach "a plurality of second logic sections" and "a plurality of third logic sections". However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to duplicate Evans' second logic section (other elements on the chip, i.e. processor on the chip) and third logic section (OR gate 21, selector/multiplexers 23, 25, 27). Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because it is well known the art that a system such as Evans' has multiple cache memories which all have to be tested. The artisan would be motivated to do so since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8 (7th Cir. 1977).

Claims 11 and 23:

Evans teaches the testing system is comprised in an ASIC (Fig. 1 is part of an IC, col. 4, ll. 37-38). Evans suggests the source (i.e. the another control signal of claims 10 and 22) is external to the ASIC in that the OR gate 21 receives the `tst_bist_mode` signal (**the another control signal**), from a JTAG controller on the IC chip (**a source external ...**), however, the illustrated circuitry will provide the inventive self-test for the cache in response to the reset and run signals, regardless of the source thereof external to the ASIC). (Col. 6, l. 62 to col. 7, l. 3).

7. Claims 3-5, 12, 15-17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans (US-6966017), hereinafter Evans, in view of Miner (US-6370661), hereinafter Miner.

Claims 3 and 15:

Evans does not explicitly teach that “the first logic section (BIST engine) provides an indication signal to the second logic section (other elements on the chip normally a processor) for indicating when the first logic section (BIST engine) is attempting to test the SUT (cache memory)”. Miner teaches in an analogous art a configurable (programmable) BIST architecture that dynamically interacts with a test controller (I/O controller). Miner also teaches the test sequences within the test management logic 570 (BIST) are configurable. More specifically, the test sequences that are designed into the test management logic 570 (BIST) are non-specific, that is, they can be configured with test parameters, provided by the test controller 580, to execute accesses to any

memory 510, within any address range, to read or write any data pattern. The test management logic 570 accepts test parameters in a configuration register 572 that are transferred from the test controller 580 (I/O controller) over the test control bus 575 and the results of a test sequence can be accessed by the test controller 580 (I/O controller) in result register 573. In one embodiment, the configuration register 572 and the result register 573 are JTAG registers. Miner further teaches test execution logic 560 (also part of BIST) directly drives address, data, and control signals on the local bus 532 to directly access each of the memories 510. Miner also discloses prior to executing a test sequence, the test execution logic 560 sends a test signal 565 to the bus unit 530 (an indication signal to the second logic section) to preclude contention on the local bus 532, thus effectively disabling the bus unit 530 during testing. (Col. 9, l. 51 to col. 11, l. 55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Evans' BIST engine (BIST controller 13, data generator 17 and address generator 15) with Miner's configurable (programmable) BIST architecture. The artisan would be motivated to do so because it would enable Evans' BIST engine sends a test signal 565 (an indication signal) to the bus unit 530 (the second logic section, i.e. Evans' other elements on the chip) to preclude contention on the local bus 532, thus effectively disabling the bus unit 530 during testing (**for indicating when the first logic section (BIST engine) is attempting to test the SUT (cache memory))**. (see Miner, col. 11, ll. 47-55).

Claims 4 and 16:

Evans in view of Miner discloses the second logic provides to the I/O controller (test controller 580) an indication that the testing of the SUT (cache memory) is occurring (a test signal 565). Evans in view of Miner also discloses the I/O controller (test controller 580) is external to the first logic section (BIST engine), the second logic section (other elements on the chip, bus unit 530), the third logic section (OR gate 21, and selector/multiplexers 23, 25, 27), and the SUT. (Col. 9, l. 51 to col. 11, l. 55).

Claims 5 and 17:

Evans in view of Miner discloses prior to executing a test sequence, the test execution logic 560 sends a test signal 565 (an indication signal) to the bus unit 530 (the second logic section) to preclude contention on the local bus 532, thus effectively disabling the bus unit during testing 530 (**data transfer to be invalidated**). (Col. 11, ll. 21-24).

Claims 12 and 24:

The coupling of the first logic section to each of the third and second logic sections is rejected as per claims 10 and 22 above. Evans does not explicitly teach that the BIST engine is “programmable”. However, Evans does teach that the BIST engine includes a BIST controller 13 and a data generator 17, which creates different background patterns in response from the BIST controller 13. Miner teaches in an analogous art a configurable (programmable) BIST architecture that dynamically interacts with a test controller. Miner also teaches the test sequences within the test management logic 570 (BIST) are configurable. More specifically, the test sequences

that are designed into the test management logic 570 (BIST) are non-specific, that is, they can be configured with test parameters, provided by the test controller 580, to execute accesses to any memory 510, within any address range, to read or write any data pattern. The test management logic 570 accepts test parameters in a configuration register 572 that are transferred from the test controller 580 over the test control bus 575 and results of a test sequence can be accessed by the test controller 580 in a result register 573. In one embodiment, the configuration register 572 and the result register 573 are JTAG registers. Miner further teaches test execution logic 560 (also part of BIST) directly drives address, data, and control signals on the local bus 532 to directly access each of the memories 510. (Col. 9, l. 51 to col. 11, l. 55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Evans' BIST engine (BIST controller 13, data generator 17 and address generator 15) with Miner's configurable (programmable) BIST architecture. The artisan would be motivated to do so because it would enable Evans to allow an operator full flexibility through the test controller 580 to configure any specific sequence of memory accesses to a memory 510. (see Miner, col. 11, ll. 47-55).

8. Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans (US-6966017), hereinafter Evans, in view of Walker (US-6539503), hereinafter Walker.

Claims 9 and 21:

Evans teaches the SUT is a memory (instruction or data cache block 11). (Col. 4, 37-41, col. 18, ll. 8-14). Evans does not explicitly teach "the second section transmits an erroneous value to be stored in the memory that may be detected during testing". Walker teaches in an analogous art error injector 630 injects an error into a codeword variable (**an erroneous value to be stored in the memory**) that is prompted by a triggering condition or event. (Col. 6, ll. 24-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Evans' second logic section (other elements on the chip, a processor on the chip) to include Walker's error injector 630. The artisan would be motivated to do so because it would enable Evans the flexibility to inject errors, i.e. erroneous values, into a memory location in the cache memory for later detection by the Evans' BIST engine.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Tabone, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3827. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John J. Tabone, Jr.
John J. Tabone, Jr.
Examiner
Art Unit 2138

ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100